

REMARKS

Claims 51-62, and 71-74 are presently pending. Claims 1-50 and 63-70 are cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 51-62, and 71-74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being obvious from Akiyama in view of Marshall.

Claim 51 recites, among other limitations, “blanking out how many pixels are indicated by the numerical value of the plurality of graphics data, while continuing storing said how many pixels that are blanked in memory”. Examiner has indicated that “Akiyama fails to teach ‘blanking out how many pixels are indicated by the numerical value of the plurality of graphics data, while continuing storing said how many pixels that are blanked in memory.’ ... Marshall obviously teaches, ‘blanking out how many pixels are indicated by the numerical value of the plurality of graphics data, while continuing storing how many pixels in memory.” Office Action at 4.

Even if the foregoing is true, Assignee traverses the rejection because Examiner has not indicated any reason that one skilled in the art would combine Akiyama and Marshall as proposed by Examiner.

Assignee also traverse the rejection because Akiyama teaches away from the claimed “blanking out how many pixels are indicated by the numerical value of the plurality of graphics data, while continuing storing said how many pixels that are blanked in memory”. Assignee respectfully submits that while col. 4, lines 6-7 recites, “For example, partition windows 76 and 77 are mapped into the exact same space in screen buffer 70”, it is noted that Akiyama also states “the partition windows associated with the partitions in the scroll group will all shift right in presentation space buffer 50 whenever the cursor is within give spaces of the right edge of a partition window.” Thus, Akiyama teaches away from “blanking out how many pixels are indicated by the numerical value of the plurality of graphics data, while continuing storing said how many pixels in memory”.

Finally, Assignee also traverses the rejection because Marshall does NOT teach “blanking out how many pixels are indicated by the numerical value of the plurality of graphics data, while continuing storing said how many pixels that are blanked in memory”. Examiner’s referenced teaching, Marshall, Col. 3, Lines 35-45 merely teaches:

“[e]ach text line is generated when the first pixel line in that text line is needed. This text line is stored in a memory buffer until all of its pixels lines are used and then is replaced by the next text line. This allows the pixels to be used without having to regenerate them each time the scroll is updated. When the last text line is reached, the first text line is generated and added onto the screen in a circular fashion. Thus, the scroll becomes a continuous loop. Typically, the scroll will be changed in one to three pixel line increments and preferably in two pixel line increments for a display having an approximately two hundred pixel line scroll.”

Assignee respectfully submits that the foregoing does not even teach “blanking out how many pixels” much less “while continuing storing said how many pixels that are blanked in memory”. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reason, Assignee respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the rejection to claim 51 and its dependent claims. Similarly, claims 55, 59 and 74 and their dependent claims should also be allowed.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, each of the pending claims in the application are allowable, thereby placing the application in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 13-0017.

RESPECTFULLY REQUESTED



Mirut Dalal
Attorney for Assignee
Reg. No. 44,052

June 6, 2008

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison – Suite 3400
Chicago, IL 60661

Phone (312) 775-8000
FAX (312) 775-8100